REMARKS

Applicants have canceled claims 1-22 and 33-42 during prosecution of this patent application. Applicants are not conceding in this patent application that said canceled claims are not patentable over prior art cited by the Examiner, since the claim cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of this patent application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue said canceled claims, and other claims, in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

The Examiner objected to the specification.

The Examiner rejected claims 23-25, 27-35 and 37-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,453,353 to Win et al., hereinafter Win.

The Examiner rejected claims 26 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Win as applied to claims 23 and 33, respectively, as cited above, and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,834,272 to Naor et al., hereinafter Naor.

Applicants respectfully traverse the specification objection, § 102 and § 103 rejections with the following arguments.

Specification Objection

The Examiner objected to the specification. The Examiner argues: "The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. The hyperlinks in question are found on page 2 of the Specification."

In response, Applicants have deleted the hyperlinks referred to by the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 23-25, 27-35 and 37-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,453,353 to Win et al., hereinafter Win.

Since claims 33-35 and 37-42 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 33-35 and 37-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is moot.

Applicants respectfully contend that Win does not anticipate claim 23, because Win does not teach each and every feature of claim 23.

As a first example of why Win does not anticipate claim 23, Win does not teach the feature: "receiving a request from a user device via a network for a virtual ID token relating to attribute information pertaining to a subscriber associated with the user device".

The Examiner argues that Win teaches the preceding feature of claim 23 in Win, Figures 5A, 5C, and col. 2, lines 42-67.

In response, Applicants cannot find a teaching of a request for a virtual ID token from a user device in Win, Figures 5A, 5C, and col. 2, lines 42-67. In fact, Applicants cannot find a request of any kind in Win, Figures 5A, 5C, and col. 2, lines 42-67.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner identify a specific request and a specific virtual ID token in Win, Figures 5A, 5C, and col. 2, lines 42-67.

Accordingly, Win does not teach the preceding feature of claim 23.

As a second example of why Win does not anticipate claim 23, Win does not teach the feature: "responsive to the request for the virtual ID token, reading a data record from a database,

said data record comprising L attributes of the subscriber, L being at least 2".

The Examiner argues that Win teaches the preceding feature of claim 23 in Win, Figures 5a, 5b and 5e, column 10, lines 14-26 and 41-55, column 11 and lines 42-64.

In response, Applicants note that the Examiner has not revealed specifically what the Examiner considers in Win to represent the claimed data record in Win, Figures 5a, 5b and 5e, column 10, lines 14-26 and 41-55, column 11 and lines 42-64. In the absence of clarity by the Examiner, Applicants assume that the Examiner considers the reading of a user profile in step 538 of Win, Figure 5E to represent the claimed "reading a data record". However, Win, Figures 5a, 5b and 5e, column 10, lines 14-26 and 41-55, column 11 and lines 42-64 does not teach that the user profile comprises at least 2 attributes, as required by claim 23. Furthermore, Figures 5a, 5b and 5e, column 10, lines 14-26 and 41-55, column 11 and lines 42-64 does not teach that reading of a user profile in step 538 of Win is "responsive to the request for the virtual ID token" as required by claim 23.

If the Examiner considers something other than the user profile to be the claimed data record in Win, then the Examiner is requested to identify specifically what the Examiner considers to be the claimed data record in Win and to provide a citation with accompanying analysis to demonstrate that reading the data record is "responsive to the request for the virtual ID token".

Furthermore, it is additionally impossible to comprehend the Examiner's argument, since the Examiner has not specifically identified the claimed virtual ID token in Win.

Accordingly, Win does not teach the preceding feature of claim 23.

As a third example of why Win does not anticipate claim 23, Win does not teach the feature: "providing the data record to the user device via the network".

The Examiner argues: "Win teaches ... providing the data record to the user device via the network (Figures 1, 2 and 6-8, column 5, lines 1-12 and column 26, lines 14-67, "remote computer can load the instructions into its dynamic memory and send the instructions over a telephone line via modem" "Communication interface 918 provides a two-way data communication coupling to a network link 920 that is connected to a local network 922" and "Network link 920 typically provides data communication through one or more networks to other data devices")".

In response, Applicants assert that the preceding quote from Win by the Examiner is taken from a discussion of a generic computer system. This discussion of a generic computer system does not teach "providing the data record to the user device via the network" wherein the "data record" is the same data record as appears in the feature of "reading a data record from a database".

Under Applicants' assumption stated *supra* that the user profile read in step 538 of Win, Figure 5E represents the claimed data record, Applicants note that in Win, FIG. 5E the user profile is not provided to the user device (as required in the preceding feature of claim 23) but rather is provided to the registry server in step 108.

Accordingly, Win does not teach the preceding feature of claim 23.

As a fourth example of why Win does not anticipate claim 23, Win does not teach the feature: "receiving, from the user device via the network, a selection of M attributes of the L

attributes, M being less than L".

The Examiner argues: "Win teaches ... receiving, from the user device via the network, a selection of M attributes of the L attributes, M being less than L (Figure 10b, column 26, lines 14-67, "remote computer can load the instructions into its dynamic memory and send the instructions over a telephone line via a modem" "Communication interface 918 provides a two-way data communication coupling to a network link 920 that is connected to a local network 922" and "Network link 920 typically provides data communication through one or more networks to other data devices")".

In response, Applicants assert that the preceding quote from Win by the Examiner is taken from a discussion of a discussion of a generic computer system that is totally silent as to the claimed "selection of M attributes of the L attributes, M being less than L".

Accordingly, Win does not teach the preceding feature of claim 23.

As a fifth example of why Win does not anticipate claim 23, Win does not teach the feature: "generating a virtual record including the M attributes selected from the data record, said virtual record comprising a virtual ID (VID) for identifying the virtual record".

The Examiner argues that Win teaches the preceding feature of claim 23 in Win, Figures 10a-10c, column 12, lines 32-55 and column 15, lines 35-52.

In response, Applicants assert that the Examiner has not specifically identified which content in Win, Figures 10a-10c, column 12, lines 32-55 and column 15, lines 35-52 allegedly represents the claimed virtual record and the allegedly included virtual ID and M attributes. Therefore, Applicants cannot evaluate the Examiner's argument, especially since the M attributes

in the virtual record are required by the language of claim 23 to be the same M attributes received from the user device. Therefore, the preceding argument by the Examiner argument is not persuasive.

Accordingly, Win does not teach the preceding feature of claim 23.

As a sixth example of why Win does not anticipate claim 23, Win does not teach the feature: "storing the generated virtual record in the database".

The Examiner argues: "Win teaches ... storing the generated virtual record in the database (column 3, lines 7-40, "storing, in the database an association of each resource to one or more of the roles", column 5, lines 13-20, column 12, lines 32-55 and column 15, lines 35-52)".

In response, Applicants assert that Win does not teach that an alleged virtual record comprising an association of each resource to one or more of the roles includes the M attributes selected from the data record and a virtual ID for identifying the virtual record", as required by claim 23. Therefore, the preceding argument by the Examiner argument is not persuasive.

Accordingly, Win does not teach the preceding feature of claim 23.

As a seventh example of why Win does not anticipate claims 23, Win does not teach the feature: "providing the virtual ID token to the user device via the network, wherein the virtual ID token comprises the VID".

The Examiner argues: "Win teaches ... providing the virtual ID token to the user device via the network, wherein the virtual ID token comprises the VID (Figures 1, 2 and 6-8, column 2, lines 42-67, column 5, lines 1-12 and column 26, lines 14-67, "remote computer can load the

instructions into its dynamic memory and send the instructions over a telephone line via a modem" "Communication interface 918 provides a two-way data communication coupling to a network link 920 that is connected to a local network 922" and "Network link 920 typically provides data communication through one or more networks to other data devices"".

In response, Applicants assert that the preceding quote from Win by the Examiner is taken from a discussion of a generic computer system. This discussion of a generic computer system does not teach "providing the virtual ID token to the user device via the network, wherein the virtual ID token comprises the VID".

Accordingly, Win does not teach the preceding feature of claim 23.

As an eighth example of why Win does not anticipate claim 23, Win does not teach the feature: ": "wherein an attribute information providing server performs said receiving the request for the virtual ID token, said reading the data record from the database, said providing the data record to the user device, said receiving the selection of M attributes, said generating the virtual record, said storing the generated virtual record in the database, and said providing the virtual ID token to the user device".

The Examiner argues: "Win teaches ... wherein an attribute information providing server performs said receiving the request for the virtual ID token, said reading the data record from the database, said providing the data record to the user device, said receiving the selection of M attributes, said generating the virtual record, said storing the generated virtual record in the database, and said providing the virtual ID token to the user device (column 3, lines 7-40, "storing, in the database an association of each resource to one or more of the roles", column 5,

lines 13-20, column 11, lines 42-64, column 12, lines 32-55 and column 15, lines 35-52)."

In response, Applicants assert that the Examiner has not properly addressed the preceding feature of claim 23. In particular, the Examiner has not identified an attribute information providing server (or any other server) performs all of the recited steps (i.e., the steps of "said receiving the request for the virtual ID token, said reading the data record from the database, said providing the data record to the user device, said receiving the selection of M attributes, said generating the virtual record, said storing the generated virtual record in the database, and said providing the virtual ID token to the user device"). Therefore, the Examiner's argument is not relevant to the preceding feature of claim 23 and is therefore not persuasive.

Accordingly, Win does not teach the preceding feature of claim 23.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Win does not anticipate claim 23, and that claim 23 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 24, 25 and 27-32 depend from claim 23, Applicants contend that claims 24, 25 and 27-32 are likewise in condition for allowance.

In order to enable Applicants to comprehend the Examiner's arguments to promote efficient prosecution of the pending claims of the present patent application, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner identify specific entities in Win that allegedly represent the following entities recited in claim 23:

> **(1) "user device";**
> **(2) "virtual ID token";**
> **(3) "data record";**
> **(4) "database";**

(5) "L attributes of the subscriber, L being at least 2";

(6) "M attributes of the L attributes, M being less than L";

(7) "virtual record"; and

(8) "virtual ID".

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 26 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Win as applied to claims 23 and 33, respectively, as cited above, and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,834,272 to Naor et al., hereinafter Naor.

Since claim 36 has been canceled, the rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is moot.

Since claim 26 depends from claim 23, which Applicants have argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over Win under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Applicants maintain that claim 26 is likewise not unpatentable over Win in view of Naor under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding amendments, Applicant respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance. Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457 (IBM).

Date: 01/25/2008

Jack P. Friedman

Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
22 Century Hill Drive - Suite 302
Latham, New York 12110
Telephone (518) 220-1850
Facsimile (518) 220-1857
E-mail: jfriedman@iplawusa.com